

JPRS 75994

7 July 1980

China Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 95

Theorists Discuss Criterion of Truth

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

7 July 1980

CHINA REPORT
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS
No. 95

THEORISTS DISCUSS CRITERION OF TRUTH

[Following are excerpts of speeches delivered by theorists in Beijing on 5 May 1980 at a forum held by the Editorial Department of GUANGMING RIBAO on the criterion of truth.]

CONTENTS

Idealist Philosophy in History Appraised (GUANGMING RIBAO, 9 May 80)	1
Works by Noted Writers Discussed (Li Qihua; GUANGMING RIBAO, 9 May 80)	12
Seeking Truth From Facts Emphasized (Yu Jishen; GUANGMING RIBAO, 9 May 80)	15
Theoretical Issues Defined at Capital Forum (GUANGMING RIBAO, various dates)	17

IDEALIST PHILOSOPHY IN HISTORY APPRAISED

Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 9 May 80 p 4

[Article: "On the Appraisal of the Idealist Philosophy in History"]

[Text] At the symposium on the history of Chinese philosophy convened in Taiyuan in October last year, discussions were carried out on an appraisal of the idealist philosophy in history. Afterwards, some comrades also published articles in DUSHU [READING] ZHEXUE YANJIU [PHILOSOPHICAL RESEARCH] and SHAANXI SHUAI DAXUE BAO [JOURNAL OF SHAANXI NORMAL UNIVERSITY] respectively and expressed some different views on the relationship between an appraisal of the idealist philosophy and insistence on the party character of our own philosophy, on whether or not the idealist philosophy also played any progressive role under certain conditions, on the meaning of a correct appraisal of the idealist philosophy and questions of the like. In order to promote even more deepening discussions, the editorial department of ZHONGGUO ZHEXUE [CHINESE PHILOSOPHY], the editorial department of WAI GUO ZHEXUE YANJIU [RESEARCH IN FOREIGN PHILOSOPHY] and the theoretical department of this newspaper, basing themselves on the spirit of letting one hundred schools of thought contend, invited on April 23 altogether 37 philosophical workers from the Philosophy Institute, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought Institute, and History Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, the Scientific History Institute of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Central Party School, Beijing University and People's University to carry out more discussions. Zhang Dainian [1728 1486 1628], Shi Jun [4258 1498], Chen Yuanhui [7115 0337 2547], Go Li [5514 0500], Xu Liangying [6079 5328 5391], Wang Shuren [3769 2885 0086], Li Zhikuai [2621 1807 6652], Huang Xinchuan [7806 1800 1557], Fang Litian [2455 4539 1131], Zhong

Yuren [6945 1342 0086], Li Minsheng [2621 2404 3932], Zhang Xianyang [1928 7359 2254], Wang Yongjiang [3769 3057 3068], Yang Yizhi [2799 0001 0037], Bao Zunxing [0545 6690 0207] and comrades of the like all made statements. Here we have sorted out certain questions discussed and attendant opinions as follows.

-- The Editor

I. On the Relationship Between a Correct Appraisal of the Idealist Philosophy in History and Insistence on the Party Character of Our Own Philosophy

Many statements pointed out that, in studying the history of philosophy by the Marxist viewpoint, we must insist on the struggle of materialism against idealism and on the Party character of our own philosophy. The problem lies in the fact that because of the influence of the ultra-Left trend of thought during the past period, there was a tendency of simplification and vulgarization in our appraisal of the idealist philosophy: total negation, death by a single blow. This was not consistent with the party character of our own philosophy.

Some comrades pointed out: some articles held that there was contradiction between our insistence on the party character of our own philosophy and a correct appraisal of idealism; this viewpoint was erroneous. Insistence on the party character of our own philosophy is the basic premise for a scientific appraisal of idealism. What we call party character is the party character of the dialectical-materialistic philosophy. Unlike the old materialist Ferenbach, we cannot find satisfaction in simple negation and rejection of idealism; we must, instead, seek to give a scientific, comprehensive analysis and appraisal of this idealist philosophy and adopt an attitude of dialectical negation toward this idealism. Therefore, there is complete consistency between insistence on the party character of our own philosophy and the scientific attitude on appraising idealism. Anything that violates science and seeking truth from facts also violates the party character principle. The party character of the Marxist philosophy is in the final analysis based on its scientific character.

Different views were expressed at the symposium on how the party character principle should be understood and carried out.

One view held that, in insisting on the party character principle, we must seek to 1) indicate the different schools of philosophy and thereby clearly recognize the struggle of materialism against idealism; and 2) indicate the relationship between philosophy and class struggle and hence insist that different schools of philosophy reflect the interests of different classes and strata: idealism basically representing the interest of the reactionary classes, and materialism representing the interest of the progressive classes.

Some statements pointed out that, in order to insist on the party character of our own philosophy, we must make a distinction between an appraisal of the idealist line and an appraisal of a school of thought. We cannot, because some idealists have played a progressive role in politics, turn around and say that idealism itself has played such a progressive role. As a line, idealism is reactionary and also anti-scientific.

Another opinion held that this viewpoint of taking idealism as an equivalent to reaction has come from the Soviet Union, but there was some modification in the 1960's. The Soviet encyclopedia says that idealism leading to reaction is a general law, but there are also often exceptions. There are propositions of a similar kind in some of our own textbooks on philosophy. This way of looking at things does not tally with historical facts. Many facts in the history of philosophy illustrate that under given conditions idealism can play a progressive role. For instance, the mystic hereticism which emerged in Europe after the 12th century held that man could strike a direct relationship with God without going through the church; this was a form of anti-religionism at the time. Also, the skepticism of Monpaigne and Pei-er of France was opposed to the reactionary scholasticism. The progressive ideas of French enlightenment thinker Rousseau were known to everybody, but his philosophical thought was idealistic and agnostic. We all know also that the German classic idealist philosophy was not the ideology of the reactionary classes but a theoretical reflection of the German bourgeois revolution.

Some statements pointed out: the viewpoint of regarding insistence on the party character principle of our philosophy as readiness to wage ruthless struggle against the idealist philosophy had something to do with the statements made by Zhdanov at the symposium on the history of philosophy in Western Europe in 1947. Zhdanov maintained in his remarks that whoever attempted to affirm that there was something good and reasonable in the idealist philosophy was in reality "propagating the idea of mercy toward the philosophical enemy," "rendering service to the false objectivism of the institutionalists," and hence had already lost his materialist standpoint and party character. Under such circumstances, idealism could of course only be negated and condemned as a whole. But this was a demonstration of a factionalist character rather than the party character. Zhdanov's statements and partial understanding of his statements constituted a source from which the ultra-Left tendency emerged on our philosophical front in the past period of some 10-odd years.

The party character principle is an analogy, a borrowing in the scholastic from political terminology; but we must take note of the difference between philosophy, scholarship, and politics. If we say that idealism is a party, just like a party in politics, this would be hardly proper. Could Hegel have acknowledged that he and Berveley were a party? I am afraid Hegel would not do so.

Just as our party history is not just a history of the struggle between the two lines, nor is the history of philosophy a struggle between the two lines alone. The history of philosophy is the total, sum, and conclusion of the history of human cognition; its content is very rich. To adopt an attitude of either completely affirming or completely negating such diverse, complicated phenomena and very rich content of the history of philosophy is not helpful to a summing up of mental experiences and lessons, not helpful to the development of the Marxist philosophy, nor helpful to our deepening and expanding study of the history of philosophy. Such a viewpoint also plays great havoc in our realistic life and tends to make people reach completely erroneous conclusions, i.e., as if those who are revolutionary in politics are necessarily unlikely to commit idealist errors, and those who do commit idealist errors are necessarily reactionary in politics. This confuse the demarcation between the enemy and ourselves and lead to rampant application of idealism in our practical work.

II. Did the Idealist Philosophy in History Have Any Positive Meaning?

One opinion held that we cannot completely negate the idealist philosophy in history but should properly point out idealism's certain definite positive meaning in theory.

(1) According to the viewpoint of Lenin's article on "A Talk on the Question of Dialectics," philosophical idealism partially and excessively develops (swells, expands) a certain characteristic, aspect or part of our cognition into the absolute which is thus separated from matter, separated from nature, and mystified. The error of idealism therefore lies in such exaggeration, but we cannot deny that it has "seen something" in that certain characteristic, aspect or part of our cognition (just as Xunzi said). Having "seen something," in this case, thus constitutes the contribution of idealism. Idealism is a flower not anticipating any fruition: this is to say that its conclusion is erroneous. But some flowers bloom beautifully. For instance, the flowers of Zhuangzi's and Wang Yangming's idealist philosophy bloomed precisely in such a refreshing way. We must let a hundred flowers bloom. Although in the long historical river of man's pursuit of truth idealism has not provided us with truth, it nevertheless played a certain promotive role: a) It proposed many questions and prompted a deepening of our theoretical reflection. For instance, Laozi's thought was of the idealist variety; but he proposed the question of the origin of heaven and earth. He said: "The Way yields one," taking for granted that what existed before the primitive chaos of the world was a supernatural way. This conclusion was erroneous, but the very suggestion of the question played a great role in man's subsequent effort to further understand nature. b) In the case of some idealist philosophies, their principal proposition was erroneous but not without some correct aspect. For instance, the rationalism of the Chong (brothers)-Zhu (Xi) school spoke of "rationality anticipating reality"; this proposition was erroneous. But Zhu Xi also said: "All things under

heaven embody a rationality"; this served to affirm the objectivity of a law, and was hence correct. We should acknowledge that the rationality Zhu Xi talked about was not just an absolute spirit or absolute idea; it also included the idea of objective law. The Lu (Jiuyuan)-Wang (Yang-ming) school spoke of "mind being no other than the source of the principle of rationality itself"--with the principle of rationality meaning here benevolence, righteousness, propriety and wisdom; this was erroneous. But the idea affirmed man's ability to think and understand, and this was a correct aspect. The fact that they did not speak of practice as the only criterion for testing truth was a mistake; but they affirmed that every man is capable of passing judgment on truth, and this enabled people to break away from the constraints of tradition. What they said therefore also has certain positive meaning.

Some statements held that there was ontological idealism, there was also cognitive idealism. From the point of view of cognition, certain categories and concepts proposed by idealism cannot all be negated. For instance, as a proposition, what Descartes said about "I think, therefore I am" was very preposterous"; but the statement had the effect at the time of denying church authority and raising the individual's status and hence had its positive meaning. Leibnitz spoke of molecules and his was the idealist type of thinking; but he suggested that molecules could activate themselves and such suggestion had quite some influence on Diderot. It therefore also played a positive role. Ninety percent of the idealist philosophy of the modern West speaks of cognition; some of it can also be absorbed for our benefit.

Idealism can also stimulate the development of materialism from the opposite side. The subjective idealism of Berkeley and the agnosticism of Hume precisely served to challenge people into proposing practice as the criterion for testing truth. Berkeley and Mach criticized Newton's absolute view of time and space; on this Einstein said: under today's circumstances, this man could possibly have proposed the theory of relativity.

Some statements pointed out: in the history of cognition the positive role of idealism has also been reflected in: a) the fact that it afforded certain realms in philosophy. The realm of "existence," for instance, was proposed by the idealist Parmenides in ancient Greece. Later on, Plato overcame the partiality of Parmenides in the denial of "non-existence," proving that non-existence was a kind of existence, and existence was also a kind of non-existence. Although Plato mistakenly thought of existence and non-existence as commonality apart from individuality, the fact that he suggested the two as opposites in unity also had a positive meaning. The realm of "concept" was first proposed by Socrates, and the realm of "idea" was first proposed by Plato: both of these had a positive meaning. b) It was in the form of idealism that certain objective laws of the development of the world were revealed. For instance, in the form of idealism Hegel proposed the three laws of dialectics. Some idealist philosophers denied the material character

and regularity of (movement of) the world but, in the course of their argument, often consciously or inadvertently revealed the law of movement. Zhi-nuo, for instance, denied movement but revealed the unity of the contradictions between the finite and the infinite, interruption and non-interruption.

Some statements pointed out that Kant destroyed the metaphysics of the past completely. What Kant proposed in terms of man's knowing disposition as the legislation of nature and a thing itself as unknowable was posted against divine authority and meant to illustrate how natural science had absolute power of control not to be interfered by divinity. The younger generation in German reading Kant's book at the time said that they felt as if they had seen a prophet and they therefore called Kant Socrates. The period in which German classic idealism prevailed was also the period in which there was maximum activity in the German ideological circles.

Some statements pointed out that certain realms and ideological forms afforded by the Indian idealist system are noteworthy. For instance, Hinayana Buddhism divides the world into a state of appearance (material phenomena), a state of mentality (spiritual phenomena), a state of mental variation (various psychological effects emanating from the mind), a state of lack of correspondence between mind and behavior (phenomena which are neither mental nor material), and a state of inactivity (phenomena of neither growth nor decay). Some sects of this school even divide man's psychological effects into 96 or 89 kinds; such minute differentiation played a promotive role in the development of simplistic materialism. In arguing for their theories and refuting the theories of other sects, the Indian idealist school developed India's own peculiar theory of logic--"causation," thus contributing not a little new content to man's history of logic.

(2) Idealism has given full play to mobility of man's subjectivity; this is a great contribution. The fact that idealism does not deal with the objective basis for the mobility of man's subjectivity is erroneous; but, in suggesting it, a great impetus was provided in the history of cognition. The sense of self proposed by Kant constituted the premise for the effectiveness of a realm. Hegel also made many contributions in the development of the mobility of man's subjectivity.

(3) When one idealist criticizes the basis of idealism of another idealist, an advantage is gained in the development of materialism.

Another opinion held that, as a philosophical line, idealism should be negated. The essence of idealism is to acknowledge the idealist theorem that spirit determines matter and thinking determines existence; how can such an idealism play a positive role? Some said that the Heavenly Kingdom of Peace had a God-worshiping Society, and this fact seemed to indicate that religion could also play a positive role. But this was

really in appearance only; what really played a role was the reality that the peasants were subjected to oppression and exploitation. True, a preposterous, superstitious thing like the Boxers Corps also could organize the peasants for struggle; but we cannot say that the superstition itself, which belongs to the idealist realm, likewise played any progressive role.

Comrades of this viewpoint held that we must differentiate idealism from the idealists. In the works of the idealists, there are plenty of ideas and utterances which correspond to objective reality; we must give an affirmative appraisal to these. But, actually, they are the materialist elements incorporated in these works. For instance, the ideology of Confucius was idealist; but, in "The Analects," he spoke of this: "I do not open up the truth to one who is not eager to get knowledge, nor help out anyone who is not anxious to explain himself." This summarized the rich educational experience of his whole life and also almost summarized the education theory of (Khailov) of the Soviet Union. It was not only dialectical, but also materialistic. The ideology of Mencius regarding how "The people are the most important, the state is the next in importance, and the ruler is the least important" and how "If the ruler regards his subjects as objects to be trampled upon, his subjects would regard him as an enemy" also played a positive role in Chinese history. Ideologies of this kind tallied with objective reality and were hence those of the materialist nature. Lenin said that in Hegel's logic there was the least of idealism and the most of materialism. In a word, the reason why most idealists were able to play a positive role was because of the utterances in their systems which tallied with objective reality or, namely, because of the materialist elements, and not because of their idealism.

Comrades expressing this viewpoint were also of the opinion that in the development of man's cognition as discussed in Lenin's "Philosophical Notes" the "circle" is a contrast to the straight line; what they meant by this was that if materialism were not united with dialectics, it would have been incomparable to idealism. Therefore, the "circle" deals with the question of the round-about forward development of materialism and does not include idealism. Idealism, this flower which does not anticipate fruition, happens to grow on the living tree of human cognition which does anticipate fruition; it hampers the growth of healthy things. It should therefore be picked off so that less nutrition would be consumed; this would facilitate the growth, development and fruition of the flower that does anticipate fruition. The peony should not be picked because it is enjoyable; but this flower of idealism must be picked off.

Idealism was no other than monasticism, or a path leading toward monasticism; could there be any positive meaning in monasticism worthy of affirmation?

Some statements held that the Marxist view that the idealist philosophy has developed the mobile aspect of man's cognition has to do only with recent philosophy, especially Hegelian philosophy, and does not necessarily accord with the situation in ancient times. There are also idealisms which do not stress the mobility of subjectivity. The philosophies of Laozi in ancient China and of Socrates in ancient Greece, for instance, would hardly show any mobility. Therefore, it would be incorrect for us to say indiscriminately that all idealist philosophies that had a positive meaning stressed the mobility of subjectivity. There were also old materialisms which stressed the mobility of man's subjectivity. For instance, Xunzi advocated "legislating the Heavenly Mandate and putting it to use"; but Dong Zhongshu retreated far behind Xunzi. Some idealisms stressed the mobility of man's subjectivity to such an excessive extent that they turned into voluntarism; thus not only they had no positive meaning, but they were even highly destructive.

III. The Relationship Between Idealism and Dialectics

In the history of philosophy, the old materialisms were often metaphysical while idealisms were sometimes united together with dialectics. Well known to all of us were, for instance, the dialectical thinking in China's ancient works such as "Laozi" and "Zhouyi," the dialectical thinking of ancient Greece's Socrates and Plato, the dialectical thinking in Germany's classic idealist philosophy, etc. India's idealist systems contained rich factors of dialectics. In the case of Buddhism, for instance, Engels noted its dialectics. Early Buddhism regarded the world as a vigorously developing process and hence carefully described the "birth," the "lingering," the "change" and the "disappearance" of worldly phenomena as well as the relationship of mutual connection and mutual restriction between them. By the time Mahayana Buddhism came into being, especially after the appearance of the dragon (banyan) tree, it gained further development. Then such phenomena were to be treated?

One view held that, although in essence idealism contradicts with dialectics, under certain conditions and to a certain extent, idealism could promote the development of dialectics.

There was one kind of idealisms (e.g., the idealisms of Socrates, Plato, and Hegel) which stressed the mobility of a concept—which stressed the development, connection and transformation of concepts; this made it possible for them to propose certain valuable dialectical thinking and to guess the dialectics of the development of things in the movement, connection and transformation of concepts. And the characteristic of the old materialisms was precisely that they were oblivious of the mobility of cognition, oblivious of the movement of concepts and their connection and transformation, and hence their cognition of self contradictions of the objective world thus also became restricted. We should say that this was one reason why old materialisms were metaphysical. There were at least two types of ancient dialectics: One was built on

the overall direct observation of the world, such as the Heraclitus-type of dialectics which generally had a direct connection with materialism. The other dialectics based on conceptual analysis, such as the dialectical ideas of Plato, Socrates, the dragon (banyan) tree, and the metaphysics of Wei and Jin Dynasties; this type of dialectics had a direct connection with idealisms with the aforesaid characteristic. This was precisely what Lenin meant when he said that "A wise idealism is closer to a wise materialism than a foolish materialism."

Another opinion held that idealism and dialectics are essentially in opposition to each other. They both appear in a work on idealism but the two are in contradiction with each other. Dialectics is positive, whereas idealism is negative. Whether one is wise or foolish depends on whether one understands dialectics. Metaphysical idealism is even more foolish. To the development of dialectics, idealism plays only a restrictive role and not a promotive role.

IV. Reasons Why Idealism Can Play a Progressive Role

In summary, there are the following points:

1. Idealism is not necessarily simplified nonsense but consequence of distortion and exaggeration "in view of" a certain aspect of objective existence. Although these distortion and exaggeration are wrong, we cannot deny their reflection of an aspect of objective existence.
2. An idealist line is erroneous, but an erroneous thing is often a prelude to correctness and it may hence contain some reasonable element. For instance, the phlogiston theory is erroneous; yet, on the basis of this theory, chemistry was not only liberated from alchemy but even discovered many important laws. Without the phlogistic theory, the correct theory of Lawaxi could not have suddenly appeared.
3. The fundamental defect of idealism is the emphasis on, and exaggeration of, the function of the spirit. But some idealisms have also stressed the mobility of man's subjectivity through exaggeration and therefore had their correct aspect.
4. Philosophical propositions are relatively abstract; different societies may well ascribe different contents to them, and they consequently may serve the interests of different groups.
5. Before the Proletarian Revolution, every revolution was that of one exploitative class poised against another exploitative class; the revolutionary class was either an exploitative class or a class of small production. The impetus of class prejudices, the smallness of the scale of production, and the limitation of historical conditions often made it possible for them only to use weapons of a low level and to adopt idealism for their struggle. For instance, in a feudal society vigorously developing

peasant movements and heretical movements often put on the cloak of theology and took advantage of religion in order to organize and mobilize the masses. Although there were historical limitations to the "nurturing" of peasant movements with religion and theology, it obviously could not simply be negated.

To sum up, man's cognition of the objective world embodies very rich contents and also has a process of round-about development; in order to provide a correct appraisal of idealism, we must start from the historical conditions at the time. The emergence of Copernicus and Einstein is closely related to the appearance of Ptolemy and Newton before. How is it possible if we ask Ptolemy to become Copernicus and Newton to become Einstein?

V. The Question of How to Unlock Idealism

One opinion held that lessons of the past 10-odd years suggest that it is not that we have not unlocked idealism sufficiently, but that idealism was rampant and excessive. In the case of utilitarianism, for instance, there have been criticisms of some 10-odd years' duration, but there are still those within the Party who choose to work on utilitarianism. Religion is a kind of idealism; can religion be unlocked? Since 1957, voluntarism and the omnipotence of spiritualism played great havoc on our socialist construction; slogans like "However great people's ambitions are, is as great as the earth's production will be," "Fear not lack of achievement, but be concerned over lack of imagination," etc., controlled people's thinking for quite a period and left a disastrous consequence in our practical work. This illustrated that the idealism of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" running rampant was by no means an accident; it also indicated that our criticism of idealism was not enough, nor was our propagation of materialism.

Philosophy is a summation of the laws of society, nature, and ideology. For the past 10-odd years, our philosophical research was very backward; reason was that we paid attention only to the summation of our experience of struggle in society while the two realms of nature and ideology were both overlooked. After World War II, natural sciences in the world made progress in great strides; but there was no reflection in our philosophy. The range of the history of philosophy was also too narrow. Esthetics and Xu Yuan's "Questioning the Heavens," etc., should all be part of the history of Chinese philosophy; but our history of philosophy mentions no such things. In a word, the reason of our philosophy falling behind can absolutely not be attributed to inadequate unlocking of idealism.

Another opinion held that there was nothing to be afraid of in the unlocking of idealism. In the development of science, certain idealisms played a progressive role. As a kind of scholastic thought, idealism can be unlocked.

"Unlocking" does not necessarily mean absence of criticism. "Unlocking" is no other than study and criticism. Idealism is a flower that anticipates no fruition; but if we pick it off, there won't be any more letting a hundred schools contend. Marxism emancipates people's thinking; that which suppresses others with rules and frameworks is not Marxism. If we cannot even unlock idealism, how are we to study and criticize it? If we do not study but only criticize idealism, we can only speak at random. When people abused and criticized idealism as soon as it was mentioned, did they bring down idealism?

It is incorrect to say that idealism is not other than monasticism. The many appraisals Lenin made of Mach, such as "great scientist, but insignificant philosopher," idealism is no other than monasticism," etc., were offered in response to the prevailing situation at the time. In reality, while Mach's certain viewpoints and conclusions were wrong, some of his methods of analysis were useful.

In the case of the West's empiricism in logic and Vienna school, some of their methods of analysis are also useful to us. We should say that in scientific research we are still behind certain idealists of the West.

Some statements pointed out: when Mr Zheng Xi proposed the "unlocking of idealism" in 1957, the term "unlocking" was not scientific. Mr Zheng Xi wrote that article at that time in response to that fact that Beijing University then did not allow the giving of any course on idealism; this easily caused misunderstanding. May we suggest that he did not mean, however, to let idealism run rampant at the time. As for the situation in these years since then, we should say that our criticism of idealism has not been sufficient, and nor has our study; our propagation of materialism has not been sufficient, and nor has our study. Consequently, idealism was allowed to run wild and to cause great destruction. We should remember this lesson.

9255

CSO: 4005

WORKS BY NOTED WRITERS DISCUSSED

Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 9 May 80 p 4

[Article by Li Qihua [2621 0796 3478]: "Also On the Discussion of Works by Noted Writers"]

[Text] On April 16, 1980, GUANGMING RIBAO published in its special section on "Letting a Hundred Schools Contend" an article by Comrade Chen Shijie entitled "Works by Noted Writers Can Also Be Discussed." This article mentioned the publication by LITERATURE, HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY of Comrade Xiao Tiefei's review of Comrade Guo Moruo's book "Li Bai and Du Fu"; after reading this, I was deeply enlightened. It is ordinarily a normal phenomenon to be able to carry out contention over certain views of a noted writer, and a noted writer ordinarily also welcomes such discussion; but somehow this became a forbidden area during an earlier period. Now this forbidden area has already been broken through; this is a situation worth celebrating in the scholastic field. Recently I read some journals and came upon certain articles on discussion with noted writers; these are the results achieved in our scholarly circles after we tried, upon the smashing of the "gang of four," to emancipate our thinking and seriously carry out the Party's policy in letting a hundred schools contend. In order to illustrate how discussion with noted writers has already become relatively common, I am making a special effort to introduce some of these articles as follows so that our comrades may have some relevant reference, though my introduction is by no means complete.

In the scholarly activity section of SCHOLARLY RESEARCH, 1979, No 1, it is mentioned that the Guangdong Society of Linguistics and Philology has invited Prof Xiao Tiefei of Shandong University to make scholarly report. In his report "On the Appraisal of Du Fu," Prof Xiao expressed certain different opinions on the questions discussed in Guo Moruo's book "Li Bai and Du Fu." LITERATURE, HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY, 1959, No 5, also published the different views of Comrade Liu Shinan on certain stanzas discussed in Guo Moruo's "Li Bai and Du Fu"—these stanzas are: "At the house of the rich there was a surplus of smelly wine and meat; On the wayside lay the bones of those frozen to death"; "separation of the newly wedded"; "song of the hut destroyed by the autumn wind"; and Li Bai's "leveling

off the Jun Hills" and "thinking of plucking the cassia in the moon." The "Measuring the Sea of Books with a Calabash" section of SCHOLARLY RESEARCH, 1979, No 3 published Comrade Jin Wei's argument on "kangong falun," with a different view from that of the venerated Guo (Moruo) on the latter's interpretation in "A Study of China's Ancient Society" of "fafu," "falun" and "fatan" taken from "The Book of Odes: Fatan."

LITERATURE, HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY, 1980, No 1 published Comrade Ding Jingtang's article "On Qu Qiubai's Contribution to the History of Modern Literature"; the article explains that Qu Qiubai had quite a few fighting essays which were discussed with Lu Xun or revised by Lu Xun and then transcribed by someone entrusted by Lu Xun, with Lu Xun's own penname signed on them as a matter of expediency, and ultimately published in the newspapers and journals. Some of these articles were even collected by Lu Xun into his essay collections later, such as "Concerning Women" in "Collection of Southern Tunes and Northern Melodies," "Chinese Language and the Chinese" in "Quasi-Wind and Moon Discussions," etc. If this is not after the smashing of the "gang of four," who in the past could have dared to suggest that Mr Lu Xun would include other people's articles in his own essay collections!

ACADEMIC MONTHLY, 1979, No 11 published "The Question of the Year of Death of Wei Yingwu, Poet of the Tang Dynasty--A Discussion with Comrade Mao Dun" written by Comrade Zhou Yi. The article says that in his article "Bai Juyi and His Contemporary Poets" published in "Harvest," Restitution Issue, Comrade Mao Dun mentioned the Tang poet, Wei Yingwu, and his skepticism about the latter's death date. But (Zhou Yi's) article points out: Comrade Mao Dun thought that it was perhaps due to faulty memory when Bai Juyi wrote about "after the death" of Wei Yingwu in his "Letter to Yuanjiu," or perhaps someone had later made some unauthorized changes in "Letter to Yuanjiu"; but Comrade Zhou thinks that neither of these two points can stand the necessary test. He thinks Bai Juyi's memory was pretty strong and he could not have remembered the wrong death date. Four years before his own death, i.e., when he was 71 years old, Bai Juyi still remembered the erstwhile incident about writing a certain poem when he was only 37 years old; he could not possibly have remembered a wrong death date of Wei Yingwu when he was such an able-bodied man at 44. Also, "Letter to Yuanjiu" was transcribed in its entirety in "The Biography of Bai Juyi," in "The New History of the Tang Dynasty," vol 166; except in the case of one sentence, "Only afterwards, other people began to attach value to it," which was transcribed as "Only thus did others begin to attach value to it," there was not a single additional error in the rest of the text. This shows that what Liu Xun saw was simply the original version of "Letter to Yuanjiu," which was definitely changed by no one.

In the same number of ACADEMIC MONTHLY, Comrade Yang Xianzhen points out in his article "On the Contention over the Question of Commonality between Thinking and Existence"; Comrade Ai Siqi thought that "the commonality between thinking and existence" was socialism and an original expression

by Engels. Comrade Yang Xianzhen holds: that was an expression of Hegel and of an idealist nature, not an expression of Engels.

ACADEMIC FORUM, 1980, No 1, published Comrade Lei Yuping's article "Can This Lead to the Elimination of the Proletarian Dictatorship?—A Critique of a Passage by Comrade Ai Siqi," which points out: in a lecture outline intended for students at the Central Party School by Comrade Ai Siqi in 1964, he interpreted the transitional period as the entire historical period from capitalist society till the high stage of the future Communist society; this was a misinterpretation. Nor did it have any basis for him to suggest that if we took the transitional period as the period from capitalist society to the low stage of the Communist society, this would lead to the elimination of proletarian dictatorship and elimination of the proletarian political party.

ACADEMIC MONTHLY, 1979, No 12, published an article of Comrade Liu Yi'an in which the author discusses his opinion about a certain chapter in vol 5 of "Chinese History" edited by Comrade Fan Wenlan. The article asserts the different opinion in several aspects, suggesting that some chapters embodied contradictions between their earlier and later parts; some other chapters did not tally with facts; still others did not refer to historical data relevantly, did not reason thoroughly, caused easy misunderstanding, and sometimes exhibited discrepancies, etc.

ACADEMIC MONTHLY, 1979, No 12, also published Su Xingyuan's article "Was Stalin's Definition Progressive or Retrogressive?" In this, he suggests his different view on certain interpretations of Comrade Sun Yefang in the latter's article "On Production Relations as the Object of Political Economy" (published in ECONOMIC RESEARCH, 1979, No 8). The author does not agree with Comrade Sun's view that there was no exchange involved in the definition of production relations as given in Stalin's "Problems of Socialist Economy in the Soviet Union," and that Stalin's definition "was not a step forward from the definition of Engels, but two steps backward."

I think that, since the abovementioned articles have all proffered different opinions on the viewpoints of noted writers, they are all in keeping with the spirit of letting a hundred schools contend and all permissible whether the opinions expressed are correct or not. Whether they are noted literateurs, philosophers, or noted historians, economists, so long as different views exist as to certain points made in their works, people ought to be allowed to express them, to develop relevant discussion and carry out exploration, in order to facilitate scholarly exchange; only thus can we carry out the policy of "Double Hundred" even more thoroughly. This should not affect the reputation of these noted writers a single bit. It is not spring when only one single flower blooms; it is spring only when hundred and thousands of flowers bloom altogether.

9255

CSO: 4005

SEEKING TRUTH FROM FACTS EMPHASIZED

Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 9 May 80 p 4

[Article by Yu Jishen [0205 3078 3234]: "Insist On Seeking Truth From Facts--After Reading 'Works by Noted Writers Can Also Be Discussed'"]

[Text] Comrade Chen Shijie's article "Works by Noted Writers Can Also Be Discussed" (in the April 16 issue of GUANGMING RIBAO) proposed an important question; but, after reading it, I felt that it seems to lack any intention to seek truth from facts. This warrants some discussion.

The author of the article maintains that we should publicly suggest opinions or develop discussions in newspapers and journals about "the points of right and wrong in the works of members of the older generation or of noted writers." There is nothing wrong with this attitude, which accords with the party's policy of letting a hundred schools contend. But, whether on the works of noted writers or otherwise, I think we should have in our discussion at least an attitude of wanting to seek truth from facts; otherwise, we can neither activate normal discussions, nor elevate our academic level. If we fail to handle the matter well, we might even lead the discussion astray. Take Comrade Chen Shijie's article as example: its certain accusations against Comrade Guo Moruo are simply baseless and unreasonable.

In the first place, the article says: "The venerated Guo once praised Du (Fu) and depreciated Li (Bai); but in his 'Li Bai and Du Fu' published in 1972, he suddenly turned around to praise Li and depreciate Du." The fact of the matter is simply not so. Between Li and Du, the venerated Guo always exalted Li Bai. In his autobiography "My Childhood" written by the venerated Guo in as early as 1928, there was already this statement: "Among the Tang poems, I like those of Wang Wei, Meng Haoran, I like Li Bai, Liu Zongyuan, and I do not like Du Fu; I even hate Han Tuizhi somewhat." The venerated Guo also said things in praise of Du Fu; but, if there was any praising or depreciating involved, his was definitely not a case of "praising Du and depreciating Li." The author of the article also mentions "Notes on Reading Poetry Commentaries of the Sui Garden" written by the venerated Guo in 1962, but it is precisely

that work which has also demonstrated his inclination to "depreciate Du." The "Notes" criticized Du on two occasions; in its postscript, the venerated Guo again especially allocated half of the space to talk about Du Fu, suggesting his opposition to elevating Du Fu to "a holy, inviolable status," his opposition to "Necessarily regard him as a 'deity,' as a 'sage,'" and his policy of "regarding Du Fu simply as a man." Without mincing any words, the venerated Guo directly "denounced Du Fu's mistakes"; while affirming that Du Fu was an outstanding poet of the feudal period, he also pointed out that "the reason our predecessors looked upon Du Fu as a sage was because he never forgot his ruler at meal time." He also maintained that the particular rhyming technique Du Fu was good at was no longer of any high value today.

Secondly, the author of the article "thought of another matter" himself, saying that when the venerated Guo published his "Notes on Reading Poetry Commentaries of the Sui Garden," he "did not accept criticisms from the readers" but even "blamed and criticized those comrades who made suggestions to him." But in reality, it was precisely in the postscript of the "Notes" that the venerated Guo appended five articles from the readers, including amendments, revisions and critical opinions. In that postscript the venerated Guo especially mentioned those letters he received which "made up what I fell short of, and, in some cases, corrected my errors"; he affirmed that these "all my precious gains" and he also expressed his "thanks." Of course, when "one or two readers made complaints in behalf of Yuan Mei" and "another one or two friends also made complaints in behalf of Du Fu" (which even more clearly indicated that the venerated Guo did not "praise Du" at the time), he did not accept their suggestions. After explaining his reasons, the venerated Guo shot back at those who blamed his "fault finding approach" and his "superfluous measure" with the observation that these critics "seemed to love scabs as if they were their cravings." This is now seized by the author of the article today as an excuse to denounce him for indulging in "individualistic likings and dislikings and easy praise of depreciation" of the ancients; this is really going a bit too far beyond facts. Worse still, the author of the article even resorts to the use of such expressions as "not allowing others to criticize," "arbitrary approach," "divine personality," etc.; I am afraid this is even less fair. Can it be that in carrying out the policy of letting a hundred schools contend only party A is allowed to criticize party B, and party B is not allowed to reserve his opinion or turn the criticism around? To sum up, things like "arbitrary approach" and "divine personality" should indeed be opposed; but labels of this kind cannot be pinned on Comrade Guo Moruo, who in his lifetime was never a random conformist in his academic research and who was also very broad-minded.

Comrade Mao Zedong advocated that when we speak or write, we must intend to seek truth from facts and not be inclined to impress people by claptrap, and he even elevated such a style to the height of the Party spirit principle in his own treatment. It looks like this approach still has its realistic meaning as a guidance to us in our effort to unfold the spirit of letting a hundred schools contend in our academic discussions today.

THEORETICAL ISSUES DEFINED AT CAPITAL FORUM

Beijing GUANGMING RIBAO in Chinese 11, 12, 13 May 80

[11 May 80 p 3]

[Special Report Part I: "Maintain Our Materialist Ideological Line, Make the Practice of Conducting Investigation and Study Prevail--Summaries of Statements at Forum of Theoretical Circles in the Capital Convened by the Editorial Department of This Newspaper"]

[Summary of statement by Liao Gailong [1675 4146 7127]: "Sum Up Historical Experience, Develop the Theories of the Party"] On the occasion of the second anniversary of the development of discussions on the criterion for testing truth, I would like to talk about the importance of insisting on the party's correct ideological line from the historical experience of our party.

Comrade Mao Zedong already suggested in the 1930's that our party's fundamental ideological principle was to unite the universal truth of Marxism with China's concrete practice. This suggestion ran through the entire history of our party like a red thread.

During the 28 years of the Party's stage of democratic revolution, i.e., in the 1920's and 1930's, we followed a "Z"-shaped path. It was only after two victories and two defeats that we finally realized the correct unity of the universal truth of Marxism and the concrete practice of the Chinese revolution, that we recognized the laws of development of the Chinese revolution, that we brought into shape China's own Marxist theory--Mao Zedong Thought. And it was only under the guidance of Mao Zedong Thought that the party led the people to win the victory of the revolution.

During the 30 years of the socialist stage, from the 1950's to the 1970's, the party once more passed through a "Z"-shaped path and experienced the difficult and devious road to the realization of the correct unity of theory and practice. It was after the victory of the first 8 years upon the founding of our state, after the setbacks from 1958 to 1960, after the recovery and development from 1961 to 1966, and again after the

heart-rending mistakes and failures of 10 years of Cultural Revolution that the party gradually and more profoundly recognized the laws of development of China's socialist revolution and socialist construction.

It was through the process of incessantly correcting our own mistakes and struggling against various erroneous ideologies that the theory of our party, namely Mao Zedong Thought, became gradually developed and perfected. Even though this theory has come into being through the collective struggle of the party and the people, and Comrade Zhou Enlai (in respect to the building of the party and the building of the people's army, in respect to the party's work in the white areas, in respect to the united front, in respect to socialist economic construction and cultural construction, in respect to the formulation of our nationalities policy, and in respect to the formulation of our revolutionary and peaceful foreign policy), Comrade Zhu De (in respect to the building of the revolutionary bases and to strategy and tactics of people's war, in respect to socialist economic construction and national defense construction), and Comrade Liu Shaoqi (in respect to the workers' movement, in respect to the building of the revolutionary bases, in respect to the building of the party, in respect to socialist construction) and revolutionaries of the like of the old generation have also made major contributions, but the one who made the greatest contribution was Comrade Mao Zedong. Comrade Mao Zedong was really the most outstanding representative of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people.

From 1957 onwards, our party has at various points also proposed certain theoretical viewpoints, situational analyses, and political slogans and principles and policies which was not in accord with objective realities and in conflict with the scientific system of Mao Zedong Thought, and thereby resulted in two great setbacks and failures. If we follow the viewpoint of the "two whatever's" and also insist on such erroneous theoretical viewpoints and principles and policies from now on, that can only endanger the cause of the party, endanger the cause of our revolution and construction, and that can only damage the prestige of the party, damage the prestige of Comrade Mao Zedong, and damage the banner of Mao Zedong Thought. Naturally, our Party Central Committee declined such an erroneous opinion.

Our Party Central Committee is disposed to insist that we must start everything from reality, connect theory with practice, seek truth from facts, and test and develop truth through practice. Our party not only dares to insist on truth, dares to insist on the scientific system of Mao Zedong Thought, and dares to correct the mistakes committed by itself, but also dares to push Mao Zedong Thought forward and further develop this theoretical system of our party. Practice has repeatedly proved that, because of our party's ideological line of insisting on testing and developing truth through practice, the party's prestige was restored and elevated further, and the banner of Mao Zedong Thought also became brighter and more radiant.

Today, the tasks of returning to order from disorder--including the tasks of readjusting and correcting the theoretical viewpoints, situational analyses, political slogans and principles and policies of the past which were not in accord with objective reality--are not yet entirely completed; the rampant poison of the ultra-Left line of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" still menacingly remains. To complete such tasks of returning to order from disorder and of eliminating the rampant poison is the very solemn task which lies in front of us.

[Summary of statement by Xing Fensi [6717 6321 1835]: "Now We Need Two In-depth Efforts"] I fully agree with what some comrades have said: let us refrain from turning the remark "Practice is the only criterion for testing truth" into an empty formula. In order not to render this principle into an empty formula, I feel that we need two in-depth efforts today: one is an in-depth effort on the party of theory itself, and one is an in-depth effort in our practical work. Politically, we have already achieved a decisive victory in the discussion on practice as the only criterion for testing truth; as an ideological line, the Third Plenary Session of the Party's 11th Central Committee has already defined it as the principle of our party's entire work from now on. But, theoretically, we should say that it has so far not entirely solved all the problems. Because this discussion was started with such vociferation, different opinions have not yet been fully expressed; after a while, different opinions gradually began to present themselves. Today, a relatively more salient question is that some comrades think the word "only" cannot stand the test. I feel that whether "the only" or not "the only" is the focus of contention over this question. In the article by a special commentator published in GUANGMING RIBAO on May 11, 1978, the word "only" was originally absent; it was later added by the editor and he added quite well. But now there is this danger, and that is to retreat from "the only" to not "the only." Is this an isolated individualistic view? No. I have received several letters and manuscripts, and those who wrote them are in my opinion all good comrades; some of them are theoretical workers, some of them are practical workers. From their letters, I can see that this question is really not quite solved. Therefore, I feel that there is a need to explain clearly from the theoretical standpoint the question why practice is the only criterion for testing truth. In order to do so, we need also to study a series of questions. For instance, how to estimate the function of logical proof? Also, historical phenomena are past phenomena; how can a historical truth be proved? Furthermore, some scientific propositions (such as the formation of the heavenly bodies) are not something which can be proved by man's practice; how are we going to judge their truthful nature? In a word, we cannot rely on political vociferation to suppress others, but we must rely on theoretical depth to persuade others. A theory must be thorough; being thorough, it can then persuade people. If this question is not solved, then practice as the only criterion for testing truth is bound to become an empty formula.

Secondly, in terms of reason, this fundamental principle of Marxism that practice is the only criterion for testing truth is actually accepted by most comrades of the whole party; but it will still take quite some effort to have it applied in our practical work. For instance, in the overall situation comrades of the Party Central Committee have suggested that we must blaze a Chinese path to the four modernizations; but if we ask how can a path be regarded as Chinese, this would then require us to gradually make it concrete. Also, taking conditions in the various regions into consideration, what contradictions and problems really exist in our effort to realize the four modernizations? What obstacles need to be overcome? What are our assets, and what are our liabilities? How to fully recognize and develop our superiorities? Questions of this kind also await solutions. And these all require us to solve them one by one according to the principle of taking practice as the only criterion for testing truth and of seeking truth from facts. In a word, there are many problems which require solutions in our practical work, but the general situation today is that we are not aware of these many problems in our practical work. Therefore, the duty of theoretical workers should be to study new situations and solve new problems on the basis of going deep down into reality in order to conduct investigation and study, and thereby promote the carrying out of the principle of practice as the only criterion for testing truth in practical work by our deeds so as to make positive contributions to the cause of the four modernizations.

[Summary of the statement by Guo Loji [6753 5012 1015]: "Praising or Denouncing 'The Will of the Superior' Also Involves Two Ideological Lines"] Comrade Sun Changjiang just mentioned "the will of the superior"; this is indeed a question of ideological line, and we need to differentiate right and wrong by insisting on the criterion of practice.

Some people were opposed to the two "whatever's" during an earlier period; but, later, they no longer insisted on the criterion of practice on certain problems. In insisting on the criterion of practice, we cannot just think of the past and overlook the present, and still less deal with others while excusing ourselves. One example in this regard is that some people are opposed to the criticism of "the will of the superior." These comrades agree, on the one hand, that "practice is the only criterion for testing truth," but on the other hand, they are opposed to the criticism of "the will of the superior," and they don't even feel that there is anything incongruous between the two. Some get the meaning by looking at the words, thinking that opposition to "the will of the superior" is no other than opposition to "the superior"; he thus willingly becomes "the superior" himself and takes opposition to "the will of the superior" directly as opposition to himself. The responsible comrade of the provincial party committee of a certain province once publicly said at a meeting: now there are some people who criticize the will of the superior; which superior does not have a will? From now on criticism of the will of the superior is not permitted!

The expression "the will of the superior" comes originally from a work of Lenin. Lenin said: Marx "overthrew the viewpoint of looking at society as a mechanical combination of individuals which can be changed at random according to the will of the superior (or according to the will of the society itself, the will of the government, just the same), or which can come into being and change by accident, and thereby for the first time placed sociology on a scientific basis, thus establishing the concept of social economic structure as the sumtotal of definite production relations, and establishing the development of this structure as a natural historical process." Here, Lenin summarily pointed out the fundamental contradiction between two views of history. The use of these two views of history on the observation and disposal of social problems leads to the emergence of two contradictory ideological lines: one is to transform society through the objective natural historical process; the other is to change society at random through the will of the superior. Therefore, opposition to "the will of the superior" is namely opposition to that subjective will which changes society at random in violation of objective laws and opposition to the idealist ideological line.

The reason people energetically criticize "the will of the superior" today is not that they have taken any point of departure from Lenin's words, but that they have a basis in reality. Here, examples of not respecting the natural historical process of social development and of changing society at random are simply too numerous among us: production relations may be modified at random apart from the development of productive forces; production targets may be raised at random; comprehensive balance may be upset at random; innocent people may be penalized at random; etc., etc. After many years of testing through practice, people are bound to question and correct the ideological line that prompts such a series of social changes at random. Lenin especially explained that it is essentially the same to call "the will of the superior" "the will of government" or "the will of society," since "the will of the superior" often appears in the form of "the will of government" or "the will of society." In whatever form it appears, because of its random command and haphazard interference it has caused enough hardship for the people, so that many have now awakened. People can generally commit an idealist mistake; but only those in the position of leadership can commit the mistake of changing society at random. Criticizing "the will of the superior" is but criticizing this idealist ideological line as exemplified by the leaders, which demonstrates the will of the masses who urgently hope that the leaders would first of all rectify their ideological line.

Some people say that criticizing "the will of the superior" is tantamount to suggesting that "the superior should have no will." This reminds me of the argument idealists have always used against materialists. Idealists have always attacked materialists for renouncing ideology, for renouncing culture, and for renouncing spiritual virtues, etc. They think that ideology can only play a decisive role; if we do not agree that ideology plays a decisive role, then we must suggest that ideology does not

play any role at all, we must be negating any ideology or culture. Such argument against materialism serves just to expose the deep-rooted prejudice of idealism. Now we have people who think that he who is a "superior" must have a will and must play a decisive role, and that if we oppose "the will of the superior" which plays a decisive role in our social life, we would deprive him of his will. Thus they exclaim: "Can it be that these superiors of ours are without a will?" Thus they issue the order not to allow criticism against "the will of the superior." This argument against the materialist ideological line serves just to expose the prejudice of those who uphold "the will of the superior." Why should anyone look upon himself as a "superior"? Correct leadership comes from the masses and returns to the masses. Correct will of leadership is to insist on the materialist ideological line, to go through investigation and study, to start from reality, to respect objective laws, and to accept the test of practice. This kind of will of leadership which communicates heart-to-heart with the masses is never going to be called "the will of the superior."

Some say that criticizing "the will of the superior" is going to lead to anarchism. Criticizing "the will of the superior" is to demand correct leadership according to the materialist ideological line, whereas anarchism is often a punishment for erroneous leadership. If one plays with "the will of the superior" and misleads the masses, anarchism would emerge one day when he cannot play it any more. Hence, criticizing "the will of the superior" is precisely designed not to allow the emergence of anarchism.

Some think that criticism against "the will of the superior" has been abusively employed, since many seek to castigate leadership opinion which does not accord with their own wishes directly as "the will of the superior." This is entirely possible. Any correct proposition can be abused, distorted, and adulterated; but we can only oppose the abuse, the distortion and adulteration of a correct proposition, and not the correct proposition itself.

Praising or denouncing "the will of the superior" involves the divergence of two ideological lines. This shows that we must still go deeper into the discussion over the criterion for testing truth.

[12 May 80 p 3]

[Special Report Part II: "Maintain Our Materialist Ideological Line, Make the Practice of Conducting Investigation and Study Prevail—Summaries of Statements at Forum of Theoretical Crises in the Capital Convened by the Editorial Department of This Newspaper"]

[Summary of statement by Yu Guangyuan [0060 0342 6678]: "To Make a Success of Work, We Must Solve the Problem of Three Layers"] I feel that in order to make a success of our work, we must solve the problem of three layers:

The first layer is to obtain the ideological premise for making a success of our work. On some problems, Marxist documents have longer provided conclusions; they really require no further discussion. But, because of ideological reasons, people's perceptions are sometimes inconsistent, or even very inconsistent. For instance, the proposition that practice is the only criterion for testing truth is originally a fundamental principle of Marxism and materialism. But before the Third Plenum of the Party's 11th Central Committee, not a little divergence of opinions did exist in our own ranks, and the focus point of divergence was that some comrades basically disagreed with practice as a criterion for testing truth. The discussions on this question which we started 2 years ago helped us to obtain an ideological premise for making a success of various kinds of our work.

The second layer is to further explore and solve the theoretical and methodological problems which are not yet solved in science. For instance, what Marx discussed in "Das Kapital" as the relationship between two categories, etc., is undoubtedly a basis of Marxist theory on social re-production; but if we wish to use it to solve the problems in our socialist construction today, it would be inadequate. Since socialized large-scale production has developed to such a degree today, and what we are carrying out today is also socialist planned economy, the Marxist theory on social re-production should really undergo some development. This requires us to conduct scientific research. Up to the present, we still have not read a book which copes adequately with the problem of principle on social re-production, which shows how difficult it is to do so.

If the problems pertaining to the first layer are those which, once we get our thinking on them straight, are then automatically solved, then the problems pertaining to the second layer are the kind which can only be gradually solved if we do hard research work and effect letting a hundred schools contend.

The third layer is our need to proposed concrete principles, policies and measures. If we only solve the problems pertaining to the first two layers but not those pertaining to the third, we still cannot make a success of our work. For instance, on the question of distributing to each according to his work, if we only achieved consistency in our perceptions, if we only solved certain theoretical questions, but have not yet formulated a proper wage system and reward system, then this question is not ultimately solved.

On the discussion of the question of criterion for testing truth, we should today direct everybody's attention to how this Marxist philosophical principle can be further carried out in such realms as politics, economics and culture. This is the main thing we must do. If we only orally acknowledge practice as the criterion for testing truth but cannot in reality look at problems according to this criterion, still adopting

other criteria for testing truth, then this practice of our most likely becomes an empty gesture.

Concerning the question of criterion for testing truth, a complete solution in practice is impossible in a short period. Why? Because this scientific philosophy of dialectical materialism is an ideology of the vanguard fighters of our proletariat; but some people do not like this kind of philosophical ideology. We hold that we should speak with reason and seek truth from facts; as for him, he refuses to accept whether or not the other side's reasoning is agreeable. We must solve this ideological problem before we can discuss and study other problems well.

Here there is a question concerning social base. Before liberation we were a country of small farmers. The ideology of small producers is always deep-rooted. One young comrade said that we should not stress our opposition to feudal thinking now but should stress our opposition to the ideology of small producers. I think this way of saying things was not exactly right. The ideology of the small producers and feudal thinking were originally not in opposition to each other; in history the small producers never went beyond the confines of feudal thinking. The backward thinking of the small producers was the very basis on which feudal thinking exerted its rule. Because the ideology of the non-dialectical-materialistic philosophy has its own social base, if we wish to thoroughly solve the question of our philosophical ideology, we must count on a long-range effort.

[Summary of statement of Wang Ruoshui (3769 5387 3055): "The Goal of Practice Is to measure the Criterion of Success or Failure of Work"]
When the question of criterion for testing truth was raised 2 years ago, it was done in response to the two "whatever's"; that is to say, it was meant to oppose using the quotations as criterion and using the book as criterion, or using authority as criterion. This was the main question at the time, and also a realistic question with political meaning. As the two "whatever's" were refuted, the main goal was also achieved. As for the question concerning the criterion of practice and logical proof, I think this is more complex. The good thing is that this is an academic question which we can discuss leisurely; it matters very little if we cannot find a solution right away.

Our achievement has been great in the carrying out of the dialectical-materialistic ideological line during the past 2 years. For instance, we have cleared up the confusing point of view on the question of class struggle. The practice of 10 years of the "Cultural Revolution" was the best test for this question. As a result of this test, we proved from the reverse that the view as expressed by Comrade Mao Zedong in 1957 on the basic conclusion of large-scale class struggle was correct, and the view opposed to this was incorrect. It was on the basis of this that the Third Plenum of the Party's 11th Central Committee proposed the shift of the focus of our work.

Now our attention has been directed to economics and this makes me think: the success or failure of practice tests the correctness or error of our perception; what, then, should we use as criterion for measuring the success or failure of practice? In reality, this also has a criterion, which is namely the goal of practice. We cannot speak of success or failure in the case of an action without a goal; when the goal is different, then we can also have different views of the result of the same practice.

What should we use to measure the success or failure of practice in production and practice in economic construction? Can we say that as long as the total output value is achieved and products are delivered, then, whether the products are needed and whether they are usable, the practice can without exception be considered a success? Are we to look only at superficial figures or are we to look at economic results? The goal of socialist production is man and his needs, including material needs and cultural needs; this being so, we should therefore estimate the success or failure, the good or poor results, of a practice according to whether it has satisfied such needs and what are the degrees of this satisfaction, and thereby also test our perception of the economic construction involved.

Material production has its goal; spiritual production also has its goal. In considering how to measure the success or failure of literary practice, we must also look at its goal. Capitalists look at art as a commodity; whatever makes money is good. We socialist countries cannot judge the good or bad quality of a play, a movie, or a song by the price at the box office, but we must look at its social effects. We cannot do completely without a price at the box office, but the social effects of those whose prices at the box office are high are not necessarily good.

Comrade Mao Zedong said: "The highest criterion for all words and deeds of Communists must be that they accord with the maximum interests of the broadest ranks of the masses of the people and they are upheld by the broadest ranks of the masses of the people." The maximum interests of the broadest ranks of the masses of the people are namely our highest goal. All our practice, including the practice in the realization of the four modernizations, is dedicated to this highest goal. Therefore, all practice which accords with the interests of the people is successful practice; all practice which damages the interests of the people is unsuccessful practice. It is this criterion which we must use in measuring the success or failure of our practice, and thereby testing the right or wrong of our perception. We have some comrades who doubt the party's policy, asking easily "whether this is rightist," "whether this is 'revisionist,'" or "whether this is damaging to a certain principle"; but they never ask "whether this damages the people's interests or accords with the people's interests." Can a measure which accords with the interests of the people be either "rightist" or "revisionist"? Can the Marxist theory reflect other than the interests of the proletariat and the people? It is time that we clear away such muddled thinking.

[Summary of statement by Zhang Teangxiao (1728 7506 7197): "Investigation and Study Require Guts and Knowledge"] Since we first discussed the question of practice as the only criterion for testing truth, 2 years have elapsed. When I read the special commentator's article in GUANGMING KIBAO at the time, I felt that the nature of its confrontation was self-evident; that is to say, it meant to promote materialism and oppose the idealism marked by modern superstition. After 2 years of practice, the importance of this question has now become even clearer. In order to insist on materialism, we must conduct investigation and study. But conducting investigation and study is not equivalent to materialism. It is not necessarily rare for someone to conduct investigation in name but practice idealism in reality, trying to find data to fill a ready framework. According to my own understanding, in order to make a success of our investigation and study, we must have both guts and knowledge. First we must have guts, i.e., we must have the courage to insist on truth. When we handle investigation and study, there are bound to be two aspects: one is the original assumption, the other is the objective situation. What are we going to do if the two do not correspond to each other? Here requires the courage to seek truth from facts. In 1958 I participated in a people's commune investigation team which originally proposed to argue about the inevitability and superiority of people's communes. As we got down to work, we discovered that the real situation was rather inconsistent with our original attempt. We visited a grave of the Chu period and saw that the carriage unearthed from there was equipped with double shafts whereas the carriage being used at the Chayashan Commune at the time had only a single shaft, with two oxen shouldering it by a crossbar. A young commune member about 20 or so years old observed that this thing we were using today proved to be even more backward than that of 2,000 years ago, so why should we still bother about working on communism or coming here to investigate at all. There were also other similar situations. When these materials were reflected to Beijing, they eventually incurred a disaster. Although we suffered as a result, we learned that we must have courage in order to carry out investigation and to have our subjective ideas correspond to objective realities, to insist on materialism. Secondly we must have knowledge. That is to say, we must be good at carrying out investigation, we must understand the overall situation, with the whole scheme in our mind.

Social situations are complex; if we grasp something at random, superficially and perfunctorily, and then immediately jump to conclusion and to decision, then such conclusion and such decision may seem to have come from reality but actually, because we are oblivious of the whole scheme, we cannot even begin to start from reality. Let me give another example. The land of my old home has fertile soil and enjoys good irrigation facilities; it is suitable for agricultural development and is relatively rich. Before the smashing of the "gang of four," one leading cadres, after only a brief tour of the place, immediately decided to build a large-scale oil refinery there. Although industry became developed, agricultural production was greatly affected. This explains that if we

cannot overcome the partiality and superficiality in our investigation and study, we cannot insist on materialism either.

[Summary of statement by Han Shuying [7201 2885 5391]: "The Discussion on the Truth Criterion Must Continue to Deepen"] Today cadres are generally concerned with how to sum up our experiences and lessons in the 30 years since the founding of our state from the angle of our ideological line; we need to unite it with reality, and further makes a distinction as to what is Marxism, what is revisionism, what is socialism, and what is capitalism. We should use practice as our criterion, summarize our international and domestic experience of practice, and come up with fully persuasive answers.

The development of our discussion on the truth criterion has not been even, and we need to continue to deepen still further. It still takes a great deal of effort to try to solve of the problems of ideological stultification among our cadres. From the theoretical point of view, at present, we must explore certain problems still further. For example, when we study materialism, we must also study dialectics; when we discuss the certainty of the criterion of practice, we must also discuss its uncertainty. Some comrades hold that we need only to discuss its certainty, and not its uncertainty; I think this view is partial. What we insist on is a dialectical-materialistic ideological line; if we only speak of its certain and not its uncertainty, a bad outcome would be caused in our practice.

We must advance in the wake of victory, and not let the criterion of practice become an empty formula. What is important is that we must apply this view in our study of the characteristics of socialist society, and in our study and solution of the theoretical and practical problems that emerge in our four modernization work. Some comrades say that for 30 years our cadres have not learned or studied enough of theory on certain important questions; not a few people have simply muddled through to where they are. In the great leap forward in 1958, there was then no guidance by any scientific theory; people's heads were far from sober. When the revolution was carried forward under the dictatorship of the proletariat, there was a theory but it was wrong. Now we are working on the four modernizations; we cannot but put theoretical study ahead of our movement. This requires us not only to study the general laws of socialist development but also to apply these general-laws to China's reality so as to walk out a path of socialist modernization in the Chinese style.

In insisting on the party's ideological line, there is also a question of improving our working method and working style. Some comrades say: "However many other laws may be known here and there, the words of the leaders are our iron law." This illustrates that at certain places and units, leadership method and working style have really become a great problem. Therefore, we feel that at present it is really necessary for

us to make the practice of conducting investigation and study prevail. People at higher and lower levels must all take practice as their criterion, and all pay attention to starting from reality, so that they will have a common language, their subjectivism can be greatly reduced, and their work can also become fruitful.

[Summary of statement by Zhang Xuyang [1728 5711 2254]: "We Must Dare to Proceed from Realities"] To start everything from reality is the foremost and fundamental demand of our materialist ideological line. The original meaning of this materialist ideological line is a design to "proceed from matter to our senses and our thinking"; that is, to start everything from reality. We often say that, in working on our four modernizations, we must understand new situations and solve new problems. Apart from starting everything from reality, we cannot even understand our old situations or solve our old problems, let alone understanding new situations and solving new problems.

Starting everything from reality is not something very easy to achieve. For instance, when we discuss a problem when often tend consciously or inadvertently to turn around in circles with concepts and forget what realities are like. Take the discussion of the question of democracy for example, precisely such a situation prevails. Originally, the slogan on the democratization of politics was proposed in response to the realities of our political life after 10 years of sabotage by Lin Biao and the "gang of four" when we, under the theoretical guidance of Marxism concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat, summed up both our positive and our negative experiences since the founding of our state. But, once a discussion is opened up, this question is often gradually replaced, in the case of some comrades, by abstract comments concerning the mutual relationship between democracy and centralism. This situation may be described this way: The first person says, we want democracy; the second person says, democracy and centralism are opposites in unity, we cannot just talk about democracy without also talking about centralism; the third person says, these two aspects are uneven, there must be a principal aspect, and at present we should stress democracy; the fourth person says, the principal aspect can transform itself, as we have stressed democracy at an earlier stage the situation has now changed, we should stress centralism; and the fifth person says, whichever aspect we may stress, we cannot, after all, set aside either of these two aspects of democracy and centralism. After turning around in such a circle, people seem to feel that the question of the democratization of politics is then solved. Some comrades think that only proceeding in this way accords with the "overall" demand of dialectics; otherwise, it would be partial. I think basically this has nothing to do with any "overall" nature of dialectics but only with subjective application of the flexibility of concepts. Because discussion of this kind fails to illustrate what situation exists in our democratic life or what problem still persists, and how a solution should be provided. Lenin said: if "subjective application of the flexibility of concepts = eclecticism and sophistry,"

then the so-called dialectical analysis divorced from reality is often actually only seemingly comprehensive eclecticism or sophistry, which not only falls short of solving any problem but, if improperly handled, even tends to cover up a problem. This requires great attention on our part.

Since we insist on starting everything from reality, then we must not start from a principle, especially not from the kind of abstract and empty principle the content of which happens to be rather ill-defined. For instance, on the reform of the people's commune system in the countryside, we cannot start from the principle of "larger in size and having a higher degree of public ownership" but mainly from the level of productive power in the locality. Marxism has never said that, under socialist conditions, a higher degree of public ownership is necessarily unconditionally better than a lower degree of public ownership, or that a larger size of productive organization is necessarily unconditionally better than a smaller size of productive organization. The actual situation is to adapt to the nature of the productive power; production relations which are capable of promoting the rapid development of productive forces are the best production relations, and all the rest are not. In some localities today, once some leading cadres hear about fixing output quota on the basis of the group or fixing responsibility on the basis of the individual, their thinking immediately turns like a reflex toward some questions like "orientation" and "path." One of the reasons for them to react this way is that they dare not to proceed from realities, because they are deadly trapped in the framework of "larger in size and having a higher degree of public ownership." I think it is time that these comrades get rid of such spiritual fetters today.

In order to start everything from reality, we must make the working style of conducting investigation and study prevail. I recall that in a letter to a secretary of a provincial Party committee in 1964 Comrade Liu Shaoqi said, our leading comrades at the various levels must understand the situations confronting them, investigate repeatedly and practice repeatedly; "if they fail to do so, then the higher their official rank, the more scarce would their truth become; the longer their tenure, the more scarce would their truth also become; this would be the case with big officials, and also with small officials." What profound remarks Comrade Shaoqi has thus uttered on how if we do not understand actual situations we would not be able to grasp truth!

[13 May 80 p 4]

[Special Report Part III: "Maintain Our Materialist Ideological Line, Make the Practice of Conducting Investigation and Study Prevail--Summaries of Statements at Forum of Theoretical Circles in the Capital Convened by the Editorial Department of This Newspaper"]

[Summary of statement by Tong Dalin [4547 1129 2651]: "Gain a Fresh Understanding of the State of the Country and the World, and Conduct Investigations and Studies on a Societywide Scale"] The Party's political line, ideological line and organizational line are now firmly established. In order to insist on this dialectical-materialistic ideological line of taking practice as the only criterion for testing truth, we must make the practice of conducting investigation and study prevail, reform our investigation and study work, and carry out investigations and studies on a societywide scale so as to help us achieve a fresh understanding of the state of the country and the world.

We all know that the Chinese Communist Party has already won victory in leading the Chinese revolution and has now taken up the historical task of leading the construction of a modern socialist China.

On the question of the Chinese revolution, because of Chiang Kai-shek's "April 12" revolt and bloody suppression, our party recognized that it was necessary to carry out armed struggle. But on the question of how to proceed with this armed struggle, perceptions within the party were by no means consistent at the start. Comrade Mao Zedong did a great deal of investigation and study work; he made profound analyses of the state of the country at the time, mainly the state of the various classes in Chinese society and the state of political and economic conditions in China's cities and countryside, and proposed a path of revolutionary armed struggle to encircle the cities from the countryside and ultimately seize political power in the whole country, and thereby liberated all of China.

On the question of building a modern socialist China, the whole party is also required to gain a fresh understanding of the state of the country and a fresh understanding of the world, and thereby gradually explore a path to win victory.

The state of the country which we need to understand in building such a China is far more extensive and complicated than the things we needed to carry out the Chinese revolution; and, along with incessant advancements in economics, culture, science and politics, the state of our country also continues to change and develop and requires us at all times to pay attention to new situations and new problems.

While working on our four modernizations, we need to start a war against earth. Hence, with respect to the natural resources in our territory, whether underground, aboveground or in the air, which are abundant, which are scarce, which are precious, and which are unprofitable, etc., etc., we obviously need to find out in general. For example, among our mineral resources, according to available statistics, there are nine kinds the production of which happens to be No 1 in the world, and there are two the production of which happens to be No 2 in the world. This might seem to entitle us to call ourselves a great country of resources, but unfortunately

the deposits of not a few of these are not yet fully investigated, and their distribution happens to be also uneven. There is also another characteristic: among them most are multiple deposits that should best be comprehensively exploited. On the basis of such a situation, what guideline should we adopt in the development of our metallurgical industry?

Again, in the case of water resources, what is our understanding of the three great rivers, the Long River, the Yellow River and the Pearl River? Some think that the middle stream of the Long River should become a main waterway for navigation, forestation, fish-raising and tourism, and that we should not bring in engineering projects which destroy the ecological balance of the area. If the mischiefs of the Yellow River can be overcome, the history of hunger, disaster, and poor agriculture in China can be ended. The Pearl River should be subject to multi-purpose economic exploitation. Are these views correct?

In trying to work out our four modernizations, we must further formulate a series of policies and measures according to our state power (manpower, material power and financial power). Take labor power as an example: the labor power in our heavy industry and our light industry makes up 60 percent and 40 percent of the overall industrial labor power respectively. Labor power in the service enterprises (including communication, transportation and telecommunications) makes up only 10 percent of the entire labor power structure (58 percent in the case of the United States, and 34 percent in the case of the Soviet Union). Is such a labor power structure rational or irrational? Does it need to be readjusted? With respect to our present social economy structure, we need likewise to conduct serious research.

In the last 20 years of the 20th century, we must emerge from conditions of our economic and scientific and technological backwardness to work fast and follow the example of the scientifically and technologically and economically developed countries. Therefore, we need not only to gain a fresh understanding of the state of our country but also a fresh understanding of the world, and especially an understanding of the developing situation of the world economy since World War II, the role of science and technology and education in social development, the social structure and social problems of the developed countries, etc., in order to absorb lessons from them, learn their strong points and make up their weak points, and thereby avoid following a devious path. We should acknowledge that for a long time and because of objective and subjective reasons our understanding of the various situations of the present world has been rather poor; we have lacked sufficient investigation and study, and hence not a few mishaps have occurred in our guidance work.

For the sake of working on our modernization, a fresh understanding of the state of our country and a fresh understanding of the world are inseparable. Our tasks in conducting investigation and study are very

heavy, since we must understand both the domestic and the world situation. For this reason, to remain satisfied with the handicraft type of investigation and study methods is no longer enough, to rely merely on the suggestions of individual experts is also no longer enough, and to rely on the experience of individual responsible working personnel can only be less adequate; instead, we must conduct investigations and studies on a "societywide" scale. That is to say, let our leading organs at the various levels, let various departments and various basic-level units all pay attention to the development of investigations and studies; let them rectify and strengthen the social sciences and the natural sciences as well as research institutions with the two combined; let them strengthen the institutions for policy research and institutions for collecting intelligence data and turn them into "collective consultants (braintrust)," and have them coordinate and communicate with one another so as to become an "investigation and study network." In this regard, there is quite some experience abroad for us to go by. In a word, in accordance with the further socialization of our entire production system, our investigations and studies must also be carried out on a societywide basis. Only on the basis of a strong, societywide scale of investigations and studies is it possible to enable our leading organs to produce major policies relatively based on the seeking of truth from facts, and thereby gradually blaze a path of modernization relatively in keeping with China's realities.

[Summary of statement by He Kuang [0149 0562]: "It Is Also Necessary to Pay Serious Attention to the Struggle to Eliminate the Influence of Feudal Ideology"] In carrying out struggle in the ideological realm, we must proceed from the state of our country. We have entered socialism from a semi-feudal and semi-colonial state, and not from a capitalist society, and still less from a highly developed capitalist society. This is the basic state of our country.

Because of insufficient perception of this point, it seemed to people that once land reform was completed, the deep-rooted feudalist and traditionalist concepts and customs of several thousand years' standing were also altogether eliminated just like the feudalist system itself; and it seemed to them that there were no longer any task of struggling against the remnant poison and influence of feudalism in the ideological realm.

Since the founding of our state, we have grasped very closely the work of opposing the bourgeois ideology; this was correct and has also been effective. We succeeded in shaping fine socialist new habits and customs in the 1950's; this had to do precisely with our work in this regard. But there were also problems in the course of our struggle against the bourgeois ideology: sometimes we opposed correct thinking and even Marxist viewpoints as if they were the bourgeois ideology; sometimes we opposed erroneous ideas of a purely perceptual nature as if they were the bourgeois ideology (someone interrupted: there was also the question of using what ideology to oppose the bourgeois ideology).

Indeed, there was the question of whether to oppose it with the Marxist ideology or with the feudalist ideology and small producers' ideology. Also, with regard to capitalist things, we must conduct some analysis too. In the case of those things which are beneficial to our socialist construction, we need to study, we need to borrow, and cannot oppose them across the board.

The appearance of the feudal fascism of Lin Biao and the "gang of four" was not accidental. Apart from objective, historical causes, the fact that in the ideological realm we failed to oppose the influence of feudalism and failed to correctly develop our struggle against the bourgeois ideology was also a very important reason.

Today, feudalist things still extensively exist in our country, such as bureaucratism, the residue of factionalism, the seeking of privilege, the practice of "What I say counts," etc.; their chief characteristic is not bourgeois, but feudalist. In continuing to develop struggle in the ideological realm from now on, we must remember the painful historical lessons, and we must correctly oppose the bourgeois ideology and thoroughly eliminate the influence of feudalism. Only thus can we create good conditions for the realization of the four modernizations.

[Summary of statement by Xiong Fu [3574 1788]: "Speed Up the Four Modernizations By Gaining a Clear Understanding of the State of the Country"] How to insist on the Party's dialectical-materialistic ideological line and further develop the discussion of the question of taking practice as the criterion for testing truth in a deepening way from now on is really a question awaiting the endeavor of everyone. I personally feel that only by taking this discussion as a component of Marxist education and uniting it with our present practice in carrying out the four modernizations can we develop it in a more deepening way and avoid lingering on the surface. Here there is a question of how we should place the emancipation of our thinking emphatically on the study of new situations, and hence there is also a question of how we should keep in touch with, and understand, realities. Take myself as an example: my thinking has not been sufficiently emancipated, nor have I sufficiently kept in touch with, or understood, realities, and these two aspects of my failure have also influenced each other. I feel that, to us, realistic situations are somewhat clear yet somewhat obscure; but to me there seems to be more that is obscure and less that is clear. We say that we want to follow "a path of socialist modernization in the Chinese style"; but what style is, after all, this "Chinese style"? I am not very clear. We say that we are "building socialism under Chinese conditions"; but what conditions are these "Chinese conditions"? Again, I am not very clear. Looking back, we have paid a price of 30 years before we shifted the focus of our work to economic construction. Except in the case of our historical experience in politics, which is better known to us, what is our historical experience in economic work itself? Again, I am not very clear. For example, we all acknowledge certain basic economic laws of socialism,

but in our practice we do things otherwise. Again, for example, we also all acknowledge the laws of planning and proportionate development, but in our practice we also do things otherwise. And furthermore, for example, we likewise all acknowledge that the whole country is like a chess board and we must have rational economic structure and arrangement of productive forces; but in our practice we also do things almost entirely otherwise. What is the economic situation in our country today? I agree with this view, that in a certain sense it is an economy of semi-self-sufficiency, of respectively segregated component sectors, and of the close-end model, with a very low degree of socialized production. How did this come about? I am not very clear either. In a word, the state of the country is not clear to us. Therefore, the question of foremost importance is for us to carry out investigation and study so as to make clear the state of our country and make clear the Chinese conditions and Chinese characteristics for socialist modernization.

In order to insist on the party's ideological line and develop the discussion on the truth criterion forward in a deepening way, I also think of the enlightenment provided us by Lenin's article "On the Meaning of Militant Materialism." In this well known essay, Lenin suggested that the Marxist militant materialism must not only form an alliance with non-party thorough materialists but also form an alliance with natural scientists. It was in response to the then existing religious tradition of the Soviet Union, and hence to the carrying out of the propagation of atheism, that Lenin suggested this formation of the two alliances. Our country today also has a task to propagate atheism; but our main task is still to propagate the general line of the four modernizations. In order to do a good job of this propagation and to unite with this propagation the further development of our discussion of the question of the truth criterion in a deepening way, I feel that we need also to form two alliances: one is an alliance between theoretical workers and practical workers, and the other is an alliance between the theoretical circles and the circles of natural sciences. In other words, we theoretical workers must join hands with the vast ranks of practical workers and with the vast ranks of natural scientists, cooperate with each other closely, and fight the battle shoulder-to-shoulder.

[Summary of statement by Lin Zili [2651 1311 0500]: "We Must Achieve A Breakthrough in Solving Many Problems"] In the past 2 years, our party has been marching forward, and our country has been marching forward: this is acknowledged by the whole world. In terms of the party's ideological and theoretical construction, because the Third Plenum of the Party's 11th Central Committee restored the scientific approach of dialectical materialism, abolished superstitions and sought truth from facts, we have achieved a breakthrough in solving many major problems-- problems such as exploiters as a class no longer exist, such as the shift of the focus of our Party's work, such as the reform of our economic management system, such as the unity between planning regulation and market regulation, such as the institutionalization of socialist democracy

and its realization in a legal system, in an orderly way, and in a disciplined way, etc. Unless we insist on practice as the only criterion for testing truth, it would be very difficult to achieve such advancement or such development in solving a series of major theoretical problems.

Although we have won victory in the discussion of the truth criterion, this discussion, in reality, is not yet concluded; and even today, there are not necessarily no different opinions on the question as to whether there is only one criterion, or there are two criteria, for testing truth. The perception and exposition of the many important problems in our Party's ideological and theoretical construction remain to be deepened. Especially along with the advancement in our modernization work, many new contradictions are bound to appear and many new problems are bound to emerge. Are the economic forms, economic structures and management practices we have been following for many years in keeping with the objective laws of modern production? If they are not, what are those scientific, law-following systems, structures and practices like? In our attempt to study and solve these problems, we can hardly depart from penetrating investigation and understanding of realistic conditions, and we must certainly insist on the fundamental principle of testing our viewpoints and conclusions through practice.

[Summary of statement by Zhang Zhoyuan [1728 0587 0337]: "Break Down the Old Conventions, Raise New Problems"] In order to insist on the dialectical-materialistic ideological line and oppose idealism of various forms, we must make the practice of conducting investigation and study prevail. I think this is an important experience we have gained in the 30 years since the founding of our state.

In June last year, the Financial and Economic Commission of the State Council organized economic workers and workers in economic theory into four groups to conduct investigations and studies in respect to our economic system, economic structure, technological importation and related theories and methods. These were investigations and studies of the largest scale and most systematic kind in respect to economic problems since the founding of our state. I joined the structure group to carry out investigations in provinces and municipalities like Jiangsu and Shanghai, and our principal concern was to investigate the question of how to bring into full play the economic superiority of the various regions. For instance, the Jiangsu investigation group suggested that we must bring into full play the economic superiority of the province by energetically developing cotton production, and we must establish rational industrial structures according to local characteristics. The Shanghai investigation group suggested that Shanghai's industrial structures must be gradually developed in the direction of less consumption of raw materials, less consumption of energy, less use of ground space, less pollution from the "three wastes," and toward the most advanced industries of fine processing capability and high technology. In the course of these investigations and studies, the comrades came to understand that, in

order to bring into full play the economic superiority of the various regions, we must energetically develop commodity production and commodity exchange and develop coordination between specialized enterprises so as to facilitate the circulation of all commodities; we must oppose mutual blockade and oppose the tendency toward self-sufficiency and toward the establishment of independent systems at each level: only thus would we be able to invigorate our national economy and thereby obtain greater economic results.

Looking back at this period of work, I deeply realize the extreme importance of investigations and studies to the good outcome of our economic construction. During this tour of investigations, not a few of our comrades dared to break down the old conventions and raise new problems--problems such as whether planning arranged in accordance with the order of agriculture, light industry, and heavy industry was scientific? Whether the priority increase in the output of the means of production was a general law? Whether economic construction centered on the heavy industry was correct? Whether a heavy type or a light type of structure was more suitable to our economic structure? Did our heavy industry belong to the self-service type? How to analyze the merits and defects of the types of our economic structure? etc. In the course of investigation, we were further enabled to recognize the importance and urgency of establishing and studying the economics of productive forces. In a word, in order to make the practice of conducting investigation and study prevail, we must insist on practice as the only criterion for testing truth and insist on the principle of seeking truth from facts in the course of such investigations and studies.

[Summary of statement by Feng Lanrui [7458 5695 3843]: "The 'Will of the Superior' Goes Against Objective Law"] It goes without saying that the so-called "will of the superior" suggests, first, that it is not the will of the masses, and, second, that it does not proceed from reality. In the past 30 years, the retrogression which twice occurred in our production had without exception to do closely with the excessive targets and blind directives under the "will of the superior." There would be no hope for the realization of the four modernizations if this "will of the superior" is not disposed of.

However, some people say that, once we criticize the "will of the superior," some people will no longer dare to offer leadership, and some people will become superiors without any will; hence the "will of the superior" should also be subject to analysis, and some may prove correct, etc. We must discuss this problem thoroughly.

Let us take up the superior first. Are we Communists superior? Comrade Mao Zedong answered long ago: Communists are servants of the people; Marx said that they are public servants of society. They are therefore servants or public servants, and not officials. There is no correspondence whatsoever between superiors and Communists. When we criticize the

"will of the superior," we are borrowing the term "superior." If our cadres look upon themselves as superiors, then they change from public servants into masters of society, and they would be forgetting that they are communists.

Now let us take up the will. Common knowledge of philosophy tells us that things like will, sense, and mentality are all subjective. Since we are materialists, whatever we do we must first investigate and study, understand the situation, and proceed from reality, and we absolutely cannot rely on our subjective will. Otherwise, whether the will of the superior or the will of the common people, it is bound to be incorrect and it is bound to be unsuccessful because it violates the objective law of the development of things.

Then, is there any good "will of the superior"? There was in the past. There were good officials and incorruptible officials in the feudal society. The reason the will of these good officials and incorruptible officials was good was because to a certain degree it reflected realistic situations and it rendered service to the people. In our era, since leaders are not officials and their correct thinking represents the people's interest, it can no longer be a "will of the superior." The so-called correct "will of the superior" simply does not make any sense. Since our leaders are neither officials nor dependent on their subjective will in doing their work, how is it that will not dare to offer their leadership? The "will of the superior" can only be the subjectivism of those who are separated from realities, separated from the masses, who regard themselves as officials and hence also overlords, and who thereby issue orders at random and resort to blind directives. Practice tells us that in order to cause no more serious consequences, the "will of the superior" must be criticized.

[Summary of statement by Yan Jiaqi [0917 1367 0366]: "Proceed from Realities and Gain a Fresh Understanding of the State of the Country"] The year before last, under the enlightenment of the article "Practice Is the Only Criterion for Testing Truth" I wrote a novel of philosophical fantasy entitled "Religion, Rationality, and Practice." Last year, in another book based on this novel entitled "The Flight Across the Epochs," I said through the mouth of a character therein: one of the important conclusions gained in theory through the discussion of the truth criterion is that "In building socialism in a country with serious remnants of feudal autocracy such as ours, apart from the necessity of opposing capitalism we must also carry out resolute struggle against feudal autocracy!" This conclusion was reached after our motherland had suffered repeated setbacks, sustained especially 10 years of disaster, and paid an extremely tragic price. Looked in today's context, it is still correct. The "two whatever's" and modern superstition are essentially feudalistic things; opposing the "two whatever's" and breaking down modern superstition are in reality carrying out struggle against feudal autocracy. Therefore, I wholeheartedly agree with the opinions of Comrades Tong

Dalin [4547 1129 2651] and He Kuang [0149 0562], that we need to proceed from realities and gain a fresh understanding of the state of our country and a fresh understanding of the world. If in respect to the state of our country we lack an understanding that tallies with realities and fail to see that today we still have a serious task to sweep away the remnants of feudal autocracy, then it would be impossible for us to have correct principles and policies for the development of science and technology and for the conduct of economic reforms and political reforms, nor is it possible for us to speak of smoothly building up a modern socialist power. Since we acknowledge that "Practice is the only criterion for testing truth," it becomes impermissible for us to proceed from certain books and concepts, but we must proceed from realities and we must have a correct understanding of the state of the country.

The Fifth Plenum of the Party's 11th Central Committee made the decision to repeal the de facto life tenure of the posts of cadres; this was a strategic measure to preclude the kind of feudal autocratic restoration as was carried out by Lin Biao and the "gang of four" under the conditions of socialism. But it is by no means a simple thing to turn something affirmed on paper into something that exists in reality. Therefore, I think unless we sweep away the garbage of feudalism, it would be impossible for us to strengthen the leadership of the party or to improve the leadership of the party, and hence it would be impossible for us to realize the four modernizations.

9255

CSO: 4005

END

**END OF
FICHE
DATE FILMED**

29 July 1980
